

Despite the clarity of § 8513 (g), Defendant argues that *Charbonneau v. State* indicated that a due process violation could be made on the proper showing. Yet *Charbonneau* found that the defendant's due process rights were not violated by the State's exclusive possession of the jurors' criminal information.² The Court also stated that *voir dire* questions about jurors' involvement in past crimes could be asked prior to trial.³ A similar result was reached in *McBride v. State*.⁴

These principles still govern the issue raised in Defendant's motion to compel. Because Defendant will have the opportunity during *voir dire* to ask necessary questions, the Court finds that Defendant has not shown that his due process or equal protection rights will be denied by the State's exclusive possession of the jurors' criminal records.

For these reasons, Defendant's motion to compel is ***DENIED***.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Richard F. Stokes, Judge

Original to Prothonotary

cc: Paula T. Ryan, Esquire
John Donahue, Esquire
Stephanie Tsantes, Esquire
John Daniello, Esquire
Joseph A. Hurley, Esquire

²904 A.2d 295, 319 (Del. 2006).

³*Id.*

⁴477 A.2d 174 (Del. 1984).